

REMARKS

In order to clarify the claimed invention, Applicant is amending independent Claims 56, 78 and 82 as explained below and to recite “wherein an inner angle between the first surface of the light scattering body and the second surface of the light scattering body is not less than 60° and is less than 180°.”

Applicant has the following response to the Examiner’s rejections in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

In the Office Action, the Examiner has the following rejections under 35 USC §103(a):

- A. Claims 56, 59-62, 64, 80, 82-84, 86 and 88 are rejected as being unpatentable over Abe (US 6,617,784) in view of Ooi (US 5,206,746).
- B. Claims 57 and 58 are rejected as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Ooi and further in view of Jones (US 5,920,080).
- C. Claim 63 is rejected as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Ooi and further in view of Shibata (US 69,147,451).
- D. Claims 78, 79, 81, 85 and 87 are rejected as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Ooi and further in view of Duggal (US 6,777,871).

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, with respect to independent Claims 56 and 82, the Examiner contends that Abe discloses all the limitations of these claims except the Examiner admits that Abe does not disclose the features of the inner angle between the light scattering body and the second surface is not less than 60 degrees and is less than 180 degrees (Claims 56 and 82) and that the light scattering body is trapezoid (Claim 82). The Examiner, however, relies upon Ooi for allegedly curing these deficiencies in Abe and contends that Ooi discloses a light scattering element having an inner angle between the light scattering body and the second surface is not less than 60 degrees and is less than

180 degrees and the light scattering body is trapezoid.

With regard to independent Claim 78, the Examiner contends that Abe discloses all the limitations of this claim except the Examiner admits that Abe does not disclose the features of the inner angle between the light scattering body and the second surface is not less than 60 degrees and is less than 180 degrees, and that the light scattering body is made of a different material from the substrate. The Examiner, however, relies upon Ooi for allegedly curing one of these deficiencies in Abe and relies upon Duggal for allegedly curing the deficiency in Abe in view of Ooi. As explained previously in Applicant's prior responses, Applicant disagrees with these contentions by the Examiner.

While Applicant traverses these rejections and disagrees with the Examiner's contentions, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and to clarify the claimed invention, Applicant is amending independent Claims 56, 78 and 82 to recite the following features "a light scattering body having a first surface and a second surface", "wherein the first surface of the light scattering body is in contact with the second surface of the substrate," and "wherein the second surface of the light scattering body is for scattering and extracting a light"

These features are shown, for example, in the present application which discloses an EL element formed over the first surface of the substrate (see e.g. Figs. 3C, 3D) and a light scattering body having a first surface (in contact with the second surface of the substrate) and a second surface (for scattering and extracting a light). This is shown, for example, in Fig. 4A. Applicant is including, for illustration purposes, a marked-up copy of Fig. 4A to show the first and second surfaces of the light scattering body.

In contrast, Ooi discloses that an illumination means (8, 18 i.e. a light emitting element) is disposed so as to face the top portion (i.e. a second surface) of the prism (2, 12 i.e. a scattering body)

as shown in Figs. 1 and 2. Hence, Ooi discloses that a first surface (7, 17) of the light scattering body (2, 12) is in contact with an optical element (1, 11, 41), and that a second surface (4A, 14A, 44A) of the light scattering body is used for scattering and absorbing a light (50A-E) which is entered from observer's side (3, 13) and is used so that a light (50G, 60) from the illumination means (8, 18) enters into the light scattering body from the second surface (4A, 14A, 44A) of the light scattering body, not from the observer's side (see e.g. Figs. 1, 2, 5, 6). Thus, the light scattering body of Ooi differs from the claimed invention and Abe, since Ooi fails to disclose that the first surface of the scattering body is adjacent to the light emitting element by contacting the first surface with the second surface of the substrate, and the second surface of the scattering body in Ooi is used for extracting a light of the light emitting element from the second surface of the scattering body into the air (i.e. observer's side). Therefore, Ooi does not disclose or suggest the claimed features of the first surface of the light scattering body is in contact with the second surface of the substrate and the second surface of the scattering body is for scattering and extracting a light.

Therefore, independent Claims 56, 78 and 82 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references and are patentable there over. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our Deposit Account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 3, 2006

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.

200 West Adams Street

Suite 2850

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 26568

Fig.4A




Fig.4B




Fig.4E




Fig.4C




Fig.4F




Fig.4D




Fig.4G

